

Non-Abelian Horizontal Symmetry and Anomalous $U(1)$ Symmetry for the Supersymmetric Flavor Problem

Nobuhiro MAEKAWA*

Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

It is shown that using non-abelian horizontal gauge symmetry and anomalous $U(1)_A$ symmetry in grand unified theories (GUTs), realistic quark and lepton mass matrices including large neutrino mixings can be obtained, while the differences among the scalar fermion masses are sufficiently small for suppression of various flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) processes, especially in E_6 GUT. Combining the Higgs sector, in which doublet-triplet splitting is realized, a complete $E_6 \times SU(3)_H$ GUT, in which three generations are unified into a single multiplet, $\Psi(\mathbf{27}, \mathbf{3})$, is obtained.

Two fundamental features, that have not yet been understood, of the standard model (SM) are the hierarchical structure of the Yukawa couplings and the replication of quarks and leptons. GUT provides a description of the unification of one family of quarks and leptons, but offers no understanding their generations. Introducing a horizontal symmetry is a natural way to distinguish these generations and to realize the hierarchical structure of the Yukawa couplings. Such an approach has been studied in the literature, with abelian horizontal symmetry [1, 2, 3], non-abelian horizontal symmetry [4], and discrete symmetry. Once supersymmetry (SUSY) is introduced to stabilize the weak scale, it is, in many cases, necessary that the first and second generation scalar fermion (sfermion) masses be nearly identical to suppress the FCNC processes. In SUSY theories, one of the most important problems is to satisfy the above two antithetical aspects of flavor physics (SUSY flavor problem). It is quite interesting that by introducing one of the various kinds of horizontal symmetries, this SUSY flavor problem can potentially be solved [5, 6, 7]. Anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry [8], an abelian horizontal symmetry, whose anomaly is cancelled by the Green-Schwarz mechanism [9], can accomplish this, though the artificial structure of Yukawa matrices must be assumed [5]. A non-abelian horizontal symmetry may be more interesting, because it is obvious that this type of symmetry results in the degeneracy of sfermion masses, though it is not easy to obtain realistic quark and lepton mass matrices in a simple way, keeping the suppression of the FCNC processes [6]. In this paper, we show that using both such symmetries, the SUSY flavor problem is naturally solved, in particular, in the GUT scenario proposed in Refs. [2, 3, 12, 13].

It is worthwhile recalling the basic features of non-abelian horizontal symmetry, and for this purpose, we consider a simple model with horizontal symmetry $U(2)$. If under $U(2)$ the three generations of quarks and leptons, $\Psi_i = (\Psi_a, \Psi_3)$ ($a = 1, 2$), transform as $\mathbf{2} + \mathbf{1}$, and the Higgs field H is a singlet, then only the Yukawa couplings for the third generation are allowed by the horizontal symmetry. This accounts for the large top

Yukawa coupling. The $U(2)$ horizontal symmetry is broken by the two vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of the doublet $\langle \bar{F}^a \rangle = \delta_2^a V$ and of the anti-symmetric tensor $\langle A^{ab} \rangle = \epsilon^{ab} v$ ($\epsilon^{12} = -\epsilon^{21} = 1$) as

$$U(2)_H \xrightarrow{V} U(1)_H \xrightarrow{v} \text{nothing}. \quad (1)$$

The ratios of the VEVs to the cutoff, $\epsilon \equiv V/\Lambda \gg \epsilon' \equiv v/\Lambda$, yield the following hierarchical structure of the Yukawa couplings:

$$Y_{u,d,e} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon' & 0 \\ \epsilon' & 0 & \epsilon \\ 0 & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the $U(2)_H$ symmetric interaction $\int d^4\theta \Psi^{\dagger a} \Psi_a Z^\dagger Z$, where Z has a non-vanishing VEV given by $\langle Z \rangle \sim \theta^2 \tilde{m}$, leads to nearly equal first and second generation sfermion masses, with

$$\tilde{m}_{u,d,e}^2 \sim \tilde{m}^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \epsilon^2 & \epsilon \\ 0 & \epsilon & O(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where the difference between these masses, ϵ^2 , results from higher dimensional interactions, like $\int d^4\theta (\Psi_a \bar{F}^a)^\dagger \Psi_b \bar{F}^b Z^\dagger Z$, through a non-vanishing VEV $\langle \bar{F} \rangle$. These mass matrices lead to the relations $\frac{\tilde{m}_2^2 - \tilde{m}_1^2}{\tilde{m}^2} \sim \frac{m_{F2}}{m_{F3}}$, where m_{Fi} and $\tilde{m}_i$ are the masses of the i -th generation fermions and the i -th generation sfermions, respectively. Unfortunately, these predictions of this simple model imply a problematic contribution to the ϵ_K parameter in K meson mixing and the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process. Moreover, it is obvious that hierarchical Yukawa couplings predicted by this simple model are similar for the up-quark sector, the down-quark sector, and the lepton sector. This is inconsistent with experimental results. In particular, in neutrino sector, with this model it seems to be difficult to obtain the large neutrino mixing angles that have been measured in some recent experiments [10, 11]. Several models in which some of these problems can be avoided have been studied in the literature [6], but there is no existing formulation in which all of these problems can be avoided in a natural manner.

In this paper, we consider a new approach employing anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry. We show that this gauge symmetry allows for all of these problems to be solved in a natural manner. The author and collaborators have already pointed out that employing the anomalous $U(1)_A$ gauge symmetry allow us to solve various problems that plague GUTs [2, 3, 12, 13], for example, the doublet-triplet splitting problem, proton instability, unrealistic GUT relations between quark and lepton Yukawa matrices, and unnatural gauge coupling unification. One of the most important features of the GUT scenario is that the theory can be defined once we fix the anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges, because generic interactions are introduced. Vacuum expectation values (VEVs) are determined by anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges as

$$\langle O_i \rangle \sim \begin{cases} \lambda^{-o_i} & o_i \leq 0 \\ 0 & o_i > 0 \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

where the O_i are GUT gauge singlet operators with charges o_i , and $\lambda \equiv \langle \Theta \rangle / \Lambda \ll 1$. Here the Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) field Θ has an anomalous $U(1)_A$ charge of -1 [14]. (In this paper we choose $\Lambda \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV, which results from the natural gauge coupling unification [12], and $\lambda \sim 0.22$.) Throughout this paper, we denote all superfields and chiral operators by uppercase letters and their anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges by the corresponding lowercase letters. When convenient, we use units in which $\Lambda = 1$. Such a vacuum structure is naturally obtained if we introduce generic interactions even for higher-dimensional operators and if the F -flatness conditions determine the scale of the VEVs. In this paper, we show that by applying the vacuum relation (4) to the Higgs which breaks the non-abelian horizontal gauge symmetry, realistic quark and lepton mass matrices including large neutrino mixing angles can be obtained, while the FCNC processes are suppressed. In other words, we show how the FCNC processes can be suppressed by introducing non-abelian horizontal gauge symmetry into our GUT scenario, in which realistic Yukawa mass matrices have already been obtained. We should note that horizontal gauge symmetry may introduce a problem, because the non-vanishing D -term may break the degeneracy of the sfermion masses. Therefore it may necessary to include some mechanism that suppresses the D -term, as in Ref. [15], but in this paper, we do not discuss this problem.

Let us explain the basic idea with an $SU(5)$ GUT model with $SU(2)_H \times U(1)_A$. The field content is given in Table I.

Table I. Typical values of anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges. The half integer charges play the same role as R-parity.

	Ψ_a	Ψ_3	T_a	T_3	N_a	N_3	H	$\bar{H}$	F_a	$\bar{F}^a$	$\bar{S}$	Θ
$SU(5)$	10	10	5	5	1	1	5	5	1	1	1	1
$SU(2)_H$	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
$U(1)_A$	$\frac{13}{2}$	$\frac{7}{2}$	$\frac{13}{2}$	$\frac{11}{2}$	$\frac{13}{2}$	$\frac{7}{2}$	-7	-7	-2	-3	5	-1

The superpotential for the S field, $W_S = \lambda^s S(1 + \lambda^{f+\bar{f}} \bar{F}F)$, leads to the $SU(2)_H$ breaking VEV $\langle \bar{F}F \rangle \sim \lambda^{-(f+\bar{f})}$. Without loss of generality, we can take $|\langle \bar{F}^a \rangle| = |\langle F_a \rangle| \sim \delta_{a2} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(f+\bar{f})}$, using the $SU(2)_H$ gauge symmetry and its D -flatness condition. Then, from the relations

$$\lambda^{\psi+\bar{f}} \Psi_a \langle \bar{F}^a \rangle \sim \lambda^{\psi+\Delta f} \Psi_2, \quad \lambda^{\psi+f} \epsilon^{ab} \Psi_a \langle F^b \rangle \sim \lambda^{\psi-\Delta f} \Psi_1, \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta f \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\bar{f}-f)$, it is obvious that with the effective charges defined as $\tilde{x}_3 \equiv x_3$, $\tilde{x}_2 \equiv x + \Delta f$, and $\tilde{x}_1 \equiv x - \Delta f$ for $x = \psi, t, n$, the Yukawa matrices of the quarks and leptons $Y_{u,d,e,\nu}$ and the right-handed neutrino mass matrix $M_{\nu R}$ can be approximated as

$$(Y_u)_{ij} \sim \lambda^{\tilde{\psi}_i + \tilde{\psi}_j + h}, \quad (Y_d)_{ij} \sim (Y_e^T)_{ij} \sim \lambda^{\tilde{\psi}_i + \tilde{t}_j + \bar{h}} \quad (6)$$

$$(Y_\nu)_{ij} \sim \lambda^{\tilde{t}_i + \tilde{n}_j + h}, \quad (M_{\nu R})_{ij} \sim \lambda^{\tilde{n}_i + \tilde{n}_j} \quad (7)$$

from the generic interactions $W_{\text{fermion}} = \tilde{\Psi}^2 \lambda^h H + \tilde{\Psi} \tilde{T} \lambda^{\bar{h}} \bar{H} + \tilde{T} \tilde{N} \lambda^h H + \tilde{N} \tilde{N}$, where $\tilde{X} \equiv \lambda^{x+f} \epsilon^{ab} X_a F_b + \lambda^{x+\bar{f}} X_a \bar{F}^a + \lambda^{x_3} X_3$ for $X = \Psi, T, N$. Throughout this paper, we omit $O(1)$ coefficients for simplicity. Then, the neutrino mass matrix is obtained as $(M_\nu)_{ij} = (Y_\nu)(M_{\nu R})^{-1}(Y_\nu^T) \frac{\langle H \rangle^2}{\Lambda} \sim \lambda^{\tilde{t}_i + \tilde{t}_j + 2h} \frac{\langle H \rangle^2}{\Lambda}$. In theories in which Yukawa couplings are determined by $U(1)$ charges, as in the above, the unitary matrices V_{yP} ($y = u, d, e, \nu$ and $P = L, R$) that diagonalize these Yukawa and mass matrices as $V_{yL}^\dagger Y_y V_{yR} = Y_y^{\text{diag}}$, the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix $V_{CKM} \equiv V_{dL} V_{uL}^\dagger$, and the Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix $V_{MNS} \equiv V_{eL} V_{\nu L}^\dagger$ are roughly approximated by the matrices $(V_{10})_{ij} \equiv \lambda^{\tilde{\psi}_i - \tilde{\psi}_j}$ and $(V_{\bar{5}})_{ij} \equiv \lambda^{\tilde{t}_i - \tilde{t}_j}$ as $V_{10} \sim V_{uL} \sim V_{dL} \sim V_{uR} \sim V_{eR} \sim V_{CKM}$ and $V_{\bar{5}} \sim V_{dR} \sim V_{eL} \sim V_{\nu L} \sim V_{MNS}$. Using the typical charge assignment given in Table I, we obtain realistic structure of quark and lepton mass matrices, in which large neutrino mixing angles are also realized.

The sfermion mass-squared matrices are written

$$\tilde{m}_y^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{m}_{yL}^2 & A_y^\dagger \\ A_y & \tilde{m}_{yR}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

In this paper, we concentrate on mass mixings through $\tilde{m}_{yP}^2$, because a reasonable assumption like SUSY breaking in the hidden sector, leads to an A_y that is proportional to the Yukawa matrix Y_y [16]. Roughly speaking, the sfermion mass squared matrix is given by $\tilde{m}_{yP}^2 \sim \tilde{m}^2 \text{diag}(1, 1, O(1))$, and the correction $\Delta_{yP} \equiv (\tilde{m}_{yP}^2 - \tilde{m}^2)/(\tilde{m}_{yP}^2)^2$ in the model described by Table I is approximately given by

$$\Delta_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^{3.5} \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^{2.5} \\ \lambda^{3.5} & \lambda^{2.5} & R_{10} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta_{\bar{5}} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^{3.5} \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^{4.5} \\ \lambda^{3.5} & \lambda^{4.5} & R_{\bar{5}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

for **10** fields and **5** fields. Here $R_{10, \bar{5}} \sim O(1)$. For example, $(\Delta_{\bar{5}})_{12}$ can be derived using the interaction $\int d^4\theta \lambda^{|f-\bar{f}|} (T\bar{F})^\dagger (TF) Z^\dagger Z$. Note that $(\tilde{m}_{d2}^2 -$

$\tilde{m}_{d1}^2/\tilde{m}_d^2 \sim (m_s/m_b)^2$, and the rather large neutrino mixing angle $(V_{MNS})_{23} \sim \lambda^{0.5}$ can be realized in the model described by Table I. The essential points are that the Yukawa hierarchy is determined by the (effective) anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges, while the corrections to the sfermion masses are determined by the VEVs as $|\langle F \rangle| = |\langle \bar{F} \rangle| \sim \lambda^{-(f+\bar{f})}$. Let us concentrate on the components $(Y_d)_{32}$, $(Y_e)_{23}$ (note $(Y_d)_{32} \sim (Y_e)_{23}$), and $(Y_{d,e})_{33}$, which are required to be of the same order to obtain large atmospheric neutrino mixing. The components $(Y_e)_{23}$ and $(Y_d)_{32}$ are obtained from the interaction $\Psi_3 T_a \bar{F}^a \bar{H}$, and actually they are suppressed by the VEV $\langle \bar{F} \rangle \sim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(f+\bar{f})} = \lambda^{2.5}$. On the other hand, the components $(Y_{d,e})_{33}$ are also suppressed by the factor $\lambda^{\psi_3+t_3+\bar{h}} \sim \lambda^2$, because of the $U(1)_A$ symmetry. It is obvious that smaller $(Y_{d,e})_{33}$ (namely, smaller $\tan \beta \equiv \langle H \rangle / \langle \bar{H} \rangle$) allows for smaller $(Y_e)_{23}$ and $(Y_d)_{32}$, and therefore, smaller $\langle \bar{F} \rangle$. This, then, leads to smaller corrections to the sfermion masses. In other words, because the negative value of the charge $\bar{f}$ can increase the Yukawa couplings $(Y_e)_{23}$ and $(Y_d)_{32}$ from the simply expected value $\lambda^{\psi_3+t_3+\bar{h}} = \lambda^2$ by a factor of $\lambda^{\bar{f}} = \lambda^{-2}$, larger values of these Yukawa couplings can be realized by smaller VEVs of F and $\bar{F}$, which lead to smaller corrections to the sfermion masses. Unfortunately, even with these smaller corrections, the FCNC processes are not suppressed for two reasons, because the neutrino mixing angles are large and because $R_5 \sim O(1)$. The various FCNC processes constrain the mixing matrices defined by $\delta_{y_P} \equiv V_{y_P}^\dagger \Delta_{y_P} V_{y_P}$ [17]. In this model, these mixing matrices are approximated as

$$\delta_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^{3.5} \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^{2.5} \\ \lambda^{3.5} & \lambda^{2.5} & R_{10} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta_{\bar{5}} = R_{\bar{5}} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^{1.5} \\ \lambda^2 & \lambda & \lambda^{0.5} \\ \lambda^{1.5} & \lambda^{0.5} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

In order to suppress the contribution to ϵ_K in K meson mixing, scalar quark masses larger than 1 TeV are required, and in order to suppress the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process, scalar lepton masses larger than 300 GeV are required.

It is noteworthy that in E_6 GUT with anomalous $U(1)_A$ symmetry, $R_{\bar{5}}$ can be small enough to suppress the FCNC processes. To understand this, first note that under $E_6 \supset SO(10) \supset SU(5)$, the fundamental representation **27** is divided as

$$\mathbf{27} \rightarrow \mathbf{16}[\mathbf{10} + \bar{\mathbf{5}} + \mathbf{1}] + \mathbf{10}[\bar{\mathbf{5}}' + \mathbf{5}] + \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{1}]. \quad (11)$$

We introduce two pairs of **27** and $\bar{\mathbf{27}}$ to break E_6 into $SU(5)$. The VEVs $|\langle \Phi \rangle| = |\langle \bar{\Phi} \rangle| \sim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(\phi+\bar{\phi})}$ break E_6 into $SO(10)$, which is broken into $SU(5)$ by the VEVs $|\langle C \rangle| = |\langle \bar{C} \rangle| \sim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(c+\bar{c})}$. Because the three fundamental representation fields $\Psi_i(\mathbf{27})$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) include $3 \times (\mathbf{10} + \mathbf{5}) + 6 \times \bar{\mathbf{5}}$ of $SU(5)$, only three of the six $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ become massless. The 3×6 mass matrix is obtained from the interactions $W = \lambda^{\psi_i+\psi_j+\phi} \Psi_i \Psi_j \Phi + \lambda^{\psi_i+\psi_j+c} \Psi_i \Psi_j C$. Note that $\psi_3 < \psi_1, \psi_2$ because top quark has larger

Yukawa couplings than the first and second generation fields. Therefore, as discussed in Ref. [3], it is natural that these three massless $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ fields come from the first and second generation fields, Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 , because the smaller charge ψ_3 results in larger masses of the $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ fields from Ψ_3 . If the first two multiplets become the doublet $\Psi(\mathbf{27}, \mathbf{2})$ under $SU(2)_H$ in this E_6 GUT, then it is obvious that the sfermion masses for these three modes $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ are equal at leading order. Then, if we fix the model by setting $(f, \bar{f}) = (-2, -3)$ and $(\psi, \psi_3, \phi, \bar{\phi}, c, \bar{c}) = (5, 2, -4, 2, -5, -2)$ (noting that odd R-parity is required for the matter fields Ψ and $\bar{\Psi}$), the massless modes become $(\bar{\mathbf{5}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2, \bar{\mathbf{5}}'_1 + \lambda^\Delta \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3)$, where $\Delta = \tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_3 + \frac{1}{2}(\phi - \bar{\phi} - c + \bar{c}) = 2$. As discussed in Ref. [13], it is natural that the Higgs fields H and $\bar{H}$ are included in $\mathbf{10}_\Phi$ of $SO(10)$. Therefore, the $\bar{\mathbf{5}}'$ fields have no direct Yukawa couplings with $\bar{H}$. The massless mode $\bar{\mathbf{5}}'_1 + \lambda^\Delta \bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$ has Yukawa couplings only through the mixing with $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_3$. Then the structure of the quark and lepton Yukawa matrices becomes the same as that found in the previous $SU(5)$ model. The correction to the sfermion masses $\delta \tilde{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}$ can be approximated from the higher dimensional interactions as

$$\frac{\delta \tilde{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}^2}{\tilde{m}^2} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^5 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^{5.5} \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^{4.5} \\ \lambda^{5.5} & \lambda^{4.5} & \lambda^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

which leads to the same $\delta_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}$ as that in Eq. (10) if we use $R_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}} = \lambda^2$. This decreases the lower limit of the scalar quark mass to an acceptable value, 250 GeV. Note that $R_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}$ can be obtained as $R_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}} = (\delta \tilde{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}^2 / \tilde{m}^2)_{33} \sim \langle \bar{\Phi} \Phi \rangle \sim \lambda^{-(\phi+\bar{\phi})}$ from the interaction $\int d^4\theta \Psi^\dagger \Phi^\dagger \Psi \Phi Z^\dagger Z$.

Another interesting feature of E_6 GUT with anomalous $U(1)_A$ symmetry is that we can extend the horizontal gauge group to $SU(3)_H$. In this model the three generations of quarks and leptons can be unified into a single multiplet, $\Psi(\mathbf{27}, \mathbf{3})$. Supposing that the horizontal gauge symmetry $SU(3)_H$ is broken by the VEVs of two pairs of Higgs fields $F_i(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3})$ and $\bar{F}_i(\mathbf{1}, \bar{\mathbf{3}})$ ($i = 2, 3$) as $|\langle F_{ia} \rangle| = |\langle \bar{F}_i^a \rangle| \sim \delta_i^a \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(f_i+\bar{f}_i)}$, the effective charges can be defined from the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{\psi+\bar{f}_i} \Psi_a \langle \bar{F}_i^a \rangle &\sim \lambda^{\psi+\frac{1}{2}(\bar{f}_i-f_i)} \Psi_i (i = 2, 3), \\ \lambda^{\psi+f_2+f_3} \epsilon^{abc} \Psi_a \langle F_{2b} F_{3c} \rangle &\sim \lambda^{\psi-\frac{1}{2}(\bar{f}_2-f_2+\bar{f}_3-f_3)} \Psi_1, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

as $\tilde{\psi}_i \equiv \psi + \frac{1}{2}(\bar{f}_i - f_i)$, $\tilde{\psi}_1 \equiv \psi - \frac{1}{2}(\bar{f}_2 - f_2 + \bar{f}_3 - f_3)$. Then, if we choose their charges as $(f_3, \bar{f}_3, f_2, \bar{f}_2) = (2, -2, -3, -2)$ and $\psi = 4$, this $E_6 \times SU(3)_H$ model gives the same predictions for the mass matrices of fermions and sfermions as the previous $E_6 \times SU(2)_H$ model. [The model obtained by choosing $(f_3, \bar{f}_3, f_2, \bar{f}_2) = (2, -3, -4, -3)$, $\psi = 13/2$, and $(\phi, \bar{\phi}, c, \bar{c}) = (-7, 3, -8, 0)$ may be more interesting, because mass matrices for quarks and leptons that are essentially the same as those in Ref. [3] are obtained if we set $\lambda^{1.5} = 0.22$.]

For both models $E_6 \times SU(2)_H$ and $E_6 \times SU(3)_H$, if we add a Higgs sector that breaks E_6 into the gauge group of the standard model, as in Ref. [13], then we can obtain complete $E_6 \times SU(2)_H$ and $E_6 \times SU(3)_H$ GUT, in which the degeneracy of the sfermion masses is naturally obtained. As discussed in Refs. [3, 13], these models yield not only realistic quark and lepton mass matrices but also natural doublet-triplet splitting. As an example, the entire Higgs content, except singlets under E_6 , is listed in Table II.

Table II. Typical values of anomalous $U(1)_A$ charges.

	A	A'	Φ	$\bar{\Phi}$	C	$\bar{C}$	C'	$\bar{C}'$
E_6	78	78	27	$\bar{27}$	27	$\bar{27}$	27	$\bar{27}$
$U(1)_A$	-1	5	-4	2	-5	-2	9	7
Z_2	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-

Here, all the Higgs fields are singlets under the horizontal gauge symmetry $SU(2)_H$ or $SU(3)_H$. Therefore additional fields that are not singlets under the horizontal gauge symmetry are required for anomaly cancellation, for example, a doublet for $SU(2)_H$ models and a $\bar{\mathbf{10}}$ for $SU(3)_H$ models. It may be interesting to introduce non-singlet Higgs fields under the horizontal gauge symmetry. This subject will be examined in the near future.

The $E_6 \times SU(3)_H$ GUT and $E_6 \times SU(2)_H$ GUT give interesting predictions for the structure of sfermion masses, in addition to the predictions on B -physics which are examined in the literature [18]. Roughly speaking, all the sfermion fields have nearly equal masses, except the third generation fields included in $\mathbf{10}$ of $SU(5)$. More precisely, this degeneracy is lifted by D -term contributions of $SU(3)_H$ and E_6 . Though the size of such contributions vary greatly among the models, and some of these contributions must be small in order to suppress the FCNC processes, it is important to test these GUT models with precisely measured masses of sfermions, as discussed in Ref. [19].

N.M. is supported in part by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.

* maekawa@gauge.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp

[1] L. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B332** (1994) 100; J.K. Elwood, N. Irges, P. Ramond Phys. Lett. **B413**, 322 (1997); N. Irges, S. Lavignac, and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 035003(1998); C.H. Albright and S. Nandi, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11**, 737 (1996); Phys. Rev. D **53**, 2699 (1996); Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. **B459**, 563 (1999); *ibid* **B482**, 145 (2000); *ibid* **B487**, 145 (2000); Nucl. Phys. **B573**, 40 (2000); M. Bando, T. Kugo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 1313 (1999); Y. Nomura, T. Sugimoto, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 093003 (2000); K.

I. Izawa, K. Kurosawa, Y. Nomura, T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 115016 (1999); M. Bando, T. Kugo, and K. Yoshioka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **104**, 211 (2000).
[2] N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106**, 401 (2001); KUNS-1740(Proceeding, hep-ph/0110276); Phys. Lett. **B521**, 42 (2001).
[3] M. Bando and N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106**, 1255 (2001).
[4] Z. Berezhiani, Phys. Lett. **B150**, 177 (1985); T. Blazek, S. Raby, and K. Tobe, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 055001 (2000); R. Kitano and Y. Mimura, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 016008 (2001); G.G. Ross and L. Velasco-Sevilla, hep-ph/0208218.
[5] Y. Nir and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B309**, 337 (1993); Y. Nir and G. Raz, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 035007 (2002).
[6] M. Dine, A. Kagan, and R. Leigh, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4269 (1993); A. Pomarol and D. Tommasini, Nucl. Phys. **B466**, 3 (1996); R. Barbieri, G. Dvali, and L.J. Hall, Phys. Lett. **B377**, 76 (1996); R. Barbieri and L.J. Hall, Nuovo Cim. A **110**, 1 (1997); K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Lett. **B387**, 87 (1996); R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, S. Raby, and A. Romanino, Nucl. Phys. **B493**, 3 (1997); Z. Berezhiani, Phys. Lett. **B417**, 287 (1998); G. Eyal, Phys. Lett. **B441**, 191 (1998); R. Barbieri, P. Creminelli, and A. Romanino, Nucl. Phys. **B559**, 17 (1999); S.F. King and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B520**, 243 (2001).
[7] D.B. Kaplan and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 3741 (1994); R. Dermisek, S. Raby, Phys. Rev. D **62** 015007 (2000).
[8] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **B149**, 351 (1984); M. Dine, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B289**, 589 (1987); J.J. Atick, L.J. Dixon and A. Sen, Nucl. Phys. **B292**, 109 (1987); M. Dine, I. Ichinose and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B293**, 253 (1987).
[9] M. Green and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B149**, 117 (1984).
[10] The Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B436**, 33 (1998); Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).
[11] The Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5656 (2001); Phys. Lett. **B539**, 179 (2002); SNO Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 011301 (2002); **89**, 011302 (2002); KamLAND Collaboration, hep-ex/0212021.
[12] N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **107**, 597 (2002); N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**, 719 (2002); hep-ph/0209217.
[13] N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **107**, 1201 (2002).
[14] C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. **B147**, 277 (1979).
[15] K.S. Babu and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2522 (1999).
[16] S.K. Soni and H.A. Weldon, Phys. Lett. **B126**, 215 (1983).
[17] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero, and L. Silverstrini, Nucl. Phys. **B477**, 321 (1996).
[18] R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, and A. Romanino, Phys. Lett. **B401**, 47 (1997); T. Goto, Y. Okada, Y. Shimizu, T. Shindou, and M. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 035009 (2002).
[19] Y. Kawamura, H. Murayama, and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B324**, 52 (1994); Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1337 (1995).